



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

*[Handwritten signature]*  
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,238	09/02/2003	Jesse R. Walker	P15875	4873
31817	7590	08/21/2006	EXAMINER	
SCHWABE, WILLIAMSON & WYATT PACWEST CENTER, SUITE 1900 1211 S.W. FIFTH AVE. PORTLAND, OR 97204			KIM, WESLEY LEO	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			2617	

DATE MAILED: 08/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/654,238	WALKER, JESSE R.	
	Examiner Wesley L. Kim	Art Unit 2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2006.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)</li> <li>2)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)</li> <li>3)<input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.</li> </ol> | <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>4)<input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br/>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.</li> <li>5)<input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)</li> <li>6)<input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.</li> </ol> |
|---|--|

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Response to Amendment***

This Office Action is in response to Amendment filed on 8/1/06.

- Claims 1-20 are currently amended.
- Claims 1-20 are pending in the current Office Action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments filed 8/1/06 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

- The applicant argues that Meier transmits a key nonce from a subnet context manager to an access point, which forwards the key nonce to the user station, therefore Meier does not teach transmitting by an access point, an access point nonce in claims 1, 5, 9, 13, and 17.

The examiner respectfully disagrees. In the claim language, the AP nonce does not have to be originated from the AP. To the examiner an AP nonce seems appears to be a nonce, which is directed towards the mobile station from the access point. Although the nonce is originated from the subnet context manager, the AP nonce still gets to the mobile device from the access point. The examiner believes that the art applied to the claims read on the amended claim.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Meier et al (U.S. Pub 2004/0103282 A1).

**Regarding Claims 1, 5, 9, and 13,** Meier teaches an article of manufacture (Fig.6;616, mobile device i.e. laptop, pda, or mobile phone) comprising a storage medium having stored thereon instructions that, when executed by a computing platform, result in an authenticated key exchange (from Fig.8, it is inherent the laptop has storage medium with instructions resulting in an authenticated key exchange), by: transmitting a probe request to an access point (Fig.8; 1<sup>st</sup> arrow transmits a probe request to an access point); and in response to the probe request, transmitting, from an access point (AP), an AP nonce in a probe response (Fig.8; 18<sup>th</sup> arrow transmits AP NONCE to mobile node).

**Regarding Claims 2, 7, 10, and 15,** Meier teaches all the limitations as recited in claims 1, 6, 9 and 14, and Meier further teaches receiving, by the AP, a pairwise master key based information element as a reassociate request from a user station that received the transmitted AP nonce (Fig.8;19<sup>th</sup> arrow transmits pairwise master key base information element), wherein the user station generates the pairwise master key (PMK) based information element based on the nonce transmitted in the probe response, a user station nonce, and a message integrity code (MIC) (Fig.8;19<sup>th</sup> arrow is based on the nonce transmitted in the probe

response and it includes the additional NONCE<sub>MN</sub> and MIC, therefore the PMK based information element is based on the nonce transmitted in the probe response, an additional nonce, and an MIC), the message integrity code being derived from the pairwise master key (Par.93 and Par.237, the PMK derives the PTKs and the PTKs derive the MIC).

**Regarding Claims 3, 6, 11 and 14,** Meier teaches all the limitations as recited in claims 2, 5, 10, and 13, and Meier further teaches generating, by the AP, a pairwise master key response element based on the user station nonce and an additional message integrity code (Fig.8;22<sup>nd</sup> arrow is sent based on an additional MIC(see 22<sup>nd</sup> arrow) and the additional NONCE<sub>MN</sub> sent earlier at the 19<sup>th</sup> arrow), the additional message integrity code being derived from the pairwise master key (Par.93 and Par.237, the PMK derives the PTKs and the PTKs derive the MIC); and transmitting, by the AP, the pairwise master response element as a reassociation response (Fig.8;22<sup>nd</sup> arrow is a response to the reassociation request sent at the 19<sup>th</sup> arrow).

**Regarding Claims 4, 8, 12, and 16,** A method as claimed in claim 3, further comprising communicating, by the AP, with the user station after the user station receives the reassociation response (Par.266;19-22).

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the

invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Meier et al (U.S. Pub 2004/0103282 A1) in view of Toyoshima (U.S. Pub 2002/0080741 A1).

**Regarding Claim 17,** Meier teaches generating a probe request to be transmitted to an access point, and to receive an AP nonce transmitted in response to the probe request (See rejection of Claim 1), however Meier is silent on the apparatus, comprising: an omnidirectional antenna; a transceiver coupled to said omnidirectional antenna; and a baseband processor.

Toyoshima teaches that it is well known in the art that a mobile device comprises an omnidirectional antenna (Fig.1;10, antenna is omnidirectional); a transceiver (Fig.1;40 and 50, transmitter and receiver) coupled to said omnidirectional antenna; and a baseband processor (Fig.1;60).

To one of ordinary skill in the art, it would have been obvious to modify Meier with Toyoshima, such that the apparatus, comprises: an omnidirectional antenna; a transceiver coupled to said omnidirectional antenna; and a baseband processor, to provide the components which perform what Meier already teaches, i.e. a mobile phone is capable of generating a probe request to be transmitted to an access point, and to receive a nonce transmitted in response to the probe request.

**Regarding Claim 18,** See rejection of claim 3.

**Regarding Claim 19,** See rejection of claim 2.

**Regarding Claim 20,** See rejection of claim 4.

***Conclusion***

**THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wesley L. Kim whose telephone number is 571-272-7867. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:00am-5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, George Eng can be reached on 571-272-7495. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2617

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

WLK



GEORGE ENG  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER